

Defendant also argues Plaintiff's notices fail to contain the modifications ordered by the Court in its conditional certification Order. Specifically, the notices use the term "landscape laborer" rather than "hourly landscape laborer." Doc. #109-2. Although the

Court approved the parties' proposed notice identifying "Hourly Landscape Laborers" as the potential class members in the notice's title, the class was defined as "[a]ll current and former landscape laborers . . . ," and did not indicate whether the laborers were hourly. Doc. #41. Further, Plaintiff only mailed notice to individuals included on the list provided by Defendant. Therefore, the "hourly" distinction is immaterial. The Court finds Plaintiff's error is harmless.

For the reasons stated above, all consent to join forms filed in this case to date are deemed timely filed, and Defendant's motion for issuance of corrective notice is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: April 17, 2019

/s/ Ortrie D. Smith  
ORTRIE D. SMITH, SENIOR JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT